



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,789	11/15/2001	Joseph Celi JR.	BOC9-2001-0037 (280)	4876
40987	7590	11/18/2004	EXAMINER	
AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			NGUYEN, QUYNH H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2642	
DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/003,789

Applicant(s)

CELI ET AL.

Examiner

Quynh H Nguyen

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1, 2, 9-10, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow et al. (U.S. Patent 6,535,730) in view of Sorsa (U.S. Patent 6,424,945).

Regarding claim 1, Chow et al. teach a method of operating a telecommunications conferencing system that includes a conference bridge having a plurality of ports. Conferencing an additional party to existing conference calls was taught in one embodiment of the invention (col. 8, line 65 through col. 9, line 8).

However, Chow et al. do not teach a voice browsing can conference additional callers within an application level.

Sorsa teaches a system and method for voice browsing IVR services using a mobile terminal. A voice browser 120 resides in mobile terminal 104 can be implemented as software and capable of interpreting a markup language such as VoiceXML (col. 5, line 62 through col. 6, line 52). Once the communications channel has been opened, voice browser 120 and voice application 122 are activated and allowing user 102 to interact with voice application 122 using mobile terminal 104 (col. 6, lines 54-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of conferencing an additional party into the voice browsing session within an application level, as taught by Sorsa, in Chow's system in order to conference additional callers into an established voice browsing session within an application level without relying upon hardware and saving on additional cost for the hardware.

Regarding claims 2 and 10, Sorsa teaches user 102 interact with voice application 122 and voice browser 120. As discussed in claim 1, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that incorporating the features as taught by Sorsa, in Chow's system would result in conferencing selected ones of a plurality of additional parties into the voice browsing session.

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Chow et al. teach a machine-readable storage (NSP 106, WCS), having stored a computer program having a plurality of code sections executable by a machine (col. 2, lines 45-51).

Regarding claims 14-16, Sorsa teaches conferencing step occurs within a VoiceXML programming environment (col. 5, lines 62-66).

3. Claims 3-7 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow et al. (U.S. Patent 6,535,730) in view of Sorsa (U.S. Patent 6,424,945) and further in view of Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,560,576).

Regarding claims 3 and 11, Chow teaches conferencing an additional party to an existing conference call (col. 8, line 65 through col. 9, line 8) reads on claimed "initiating

Art Unit: 2642

an outbound call from the conferencing component to the additional party". However, Chow does not teach providing an identifier associated with said additional party from the voice browser to the conferencing component.

Cohen et al. teach a user might access content on a Voice Web site using a conventional telephone or a voice-enabled personal computer. The content may include various voice-enabled software applications that respond to a user's recognized speech (col. 2, lines 48-65), therefore speech recognition would be used as an identifier associated with the additional party.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of providing an identifier associated with the additional party from the voice browser, as taught by Cohen, in Chow's system in order to allow other participants in the conference refer to other participant by his or her associates identifier. Using identifier to refer to a particular caller is sometimes desirable for quick reference or security and privacy purposes.

Claims 4-5, 7, and 12-13 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1 and 2. Furthermore, Sorsa teaches aggregating a voice data stream of the additional party with a voice data stream of the calling party into a single voice data stream; and sending the single voice data stream for processing to the voice browser; and sending audio from the voice browser to the calling party and the additional party (col. 5, line 44 through col. 8, line 40).

Claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 4.

Art Unit: 2642

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow et al. (U.S. Patent 6,535,730) in view of Sorsa (U.S. Patent 6,424,945) in view of Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,560,576) and further in view of Bassenyemukasa et al. (U.S. Patent 5,623,539).

Regarding claim 8, Chow et al. and Sorsa do not teach a discriminator configured to discriminate between a voice data stream of the calling party and the additional party and selectively route audio from the voice browser to at least one voice browser.

Bassenyemukasa et al. teach a system and method for detecting and preventing telephone fraud employing. In one embodiment, voice input from a live conversation is segmented to separate segments of voice information from nonvoice information (col. 2, lines 27-32); and a voice segregator segregating received voice information (col. 2, lines 36-52); and each speaker's voice is transmitted separately (col. 6, lines 22-41).

Discriminating whose voice in a conference or telephone conversation is desirable. The advantage of distinguishing the voice of a person that is talking during any conversation is also well known. For example, in a call center, while a customer service representative or agent is helping a customer, discriminating the voice of the agent and the customer is helpful to know that during the conversation between the agent and the customer how long the agent spent talking.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that Chow is silent as to adding additional caller using application level and Sorsa is silent as to conference calling. Examiner respectfully submits that Chow et al. teach a method of operating a telecommunications conferencing system that includes a conference bridge having a plurality of ports, and conferencing an additional party to existing conference calls (col. 8, line 65 through col. 9, line 8). And Sorsa teaches a system and method for voice browsing IVR services using a mobile terminal. A voice browser 120 resides in mobile terminal 104 can be implemented as software and capable of interpreting a markup language such as VoiceXML (col. 5, line 62 through col. 6, line 52). Once the communications channel has been opened, voice browser 120 and voice application 122 are activated and allowing user 102 to interact with voice application 122 using mobile terminal 104 (col. 6, lines 54-62). The combination of the two references teaches the claims invention.

Applicant argues that Sorsa fails to teach or suggest using a voice browser within a human-to-human interaction in any manner. This is irrelevant and not in the claims.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2642

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

qhn

Quynh H. Nguyen
November 10, 2004



AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600